

GENERAL REMARKS

With the amendment above, Applicant has amended the Application in accordance with the Office Action. Applicant has cancelled claim 1 rejected in the Office Action on grounds of being unpatentable given Bock's US Patent 6,707,410 in combination with Bidermann et al's US Patent 6,788,237. Subsequent claims dependent on claim 1 have been re-written to incorporate the limitations of rejected claim 1 along with their own original limitations. Also, a typographical error in claims 15, 16, and 17 referring to claim 13 rather than claim 14 has been corrected.

Specification Reviewed

Applicant has reviewed the specification for typographical and grammar errors to be corrected and has not found any.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC SS 103 (a) – Allowable dependent claims re-written

The Office Action rejected the original claim 1 "as being unpatentable over Bock (US 6,707,410) in view of Bidermann et al (US 6,788,237)". Claim 1 had claims 2 through 13 as dependent claims. These claims were allowed by the Office Action subject if "rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims".

Applicant notes that Bidermann et al (US 6,788,237) is a US patent issued on September 7, 2004 and filed on July 15, 2003. Bidermann's filing date was 8 months prior to Applicant's application date, but publication was 4 months after Applicant's application date.

Applicant has cancelled the original claim 1 and has rewritten claims 2, 7, 9, 11, 12, and 13 as independent claims each of which incorporates both its original limitations and the limitations of original claim 1. Claims 3, 4, 5, and 6 have not been changed as they refer to claim 1 by way of claim 2 and dependent claims. Claim 8 has not been changed as it refers to claim 1 by way of claim 7. Claim 10 has not been changed as it refers to claim 1 by way of claim 9.

Applicant therefore submits that claim **1** has been cancelled and that claims **2** through **13** are now in a form that is allowable per the Office Action.

Typographical Error in Claims 15, 16, and 17 Has Been Corrected

Applicant noted that original claims **15**, **16**, and **17** each referred to "The machine of claim **13**" rather than to the correct parent claim, claim **14**. Claims **15**, **16**, and **17** each refer to "said threshold detectors", an element which is not present in claim **13** and which is present in claim **14**. Additionally, the correct dependency on claim **14** is supported by extensive discussion in the specification and by Fig. 2B.

Applicant therefore submits that dependent claims **15**, **16**, and **17** now properly reference independent claim **14**.

More Than Three Independent Claims After Re-Drafting

Applicant notes that in original application there were three independent claims, namely original claims **1**, **14**, and **19**. With cancellation of original claim **1**, claims **2**, **7**, **9**, **11**, **12**, and **13** are independent claims in addition to claims **14** and **19**. In total, there are now 8 independent claims.

With the present Amendment, Applicant has filed payment for 5 independent claims beyond the 3 covered in the initial filing payment.



Conclusion

For all the above reasons, the Applicant submits that the specification and the claims are now in proper form, and that the claims are all patentable over the prior art. Therefore, the Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully solicited.

Conditional Request for Constructive Assistance

The Applicant has amended the specification and claims of this application so that they are proper, definite, and define novel structure which is also unobvious. If, for any reason this application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, the Applicant, an independent inventor and pro se filer, respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner pursuant to M.P.E.P SS 2173.02 and SS 707.07(j) in order that the undersigned can place this application in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

Very Respectfully,

Charles D. Murphy

601 Linden Place #210
Evanston, IL 60202
(847) 864-8514

Certificate of Mailing: I hereby certify that this correspondence, and attachments, if any, will be deposited with the United States Postal Service by Overnight Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to "Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date below.

June 1, 2005

Charles Douglas Murphy, Applicant